



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## APPENDIX, No. V.

*AMENDED NOTES to Mr. Hodgson's "Sketch of Buddhism."\**

THE following Memorandum was received from Mr. Hodgson, subsequently to the publication of his "Sketch of Buddhism," in the first part of this volume, and of course, too late to make the alterations he wished in the Notes appended to that Paper. The Council, however, have considered it but just to Mr. Hodgson himself, as well as due to the Public, that all the information they possess upon this abstruse point should be submitted in its most perfect form, and have accordingly directed the publication of this Paper in the *Appendix* to the Volume. It may be added, that in a Letter accompanying the present Memorandum, Mr. Hodgson refers those who feel a desire to become better acquainted with the Metaphysics and Mysticism of the *Bauddha* Philosophy and Religion, to a Paper upon that subject, in the sixteenth volume of the Bengal Asiatic Researches, which he considers the more perfect result of his labours in that particular branch of Oriental science.

I should recommend it to those who would read the following paper with advantage, first to cast an eye over the faint outline of *Saugata* philosophy, which I have attempted to delineate in the sixteenth volume of the Bengal Asiatic Society's Transactions, pp. 435-440.

The religious system of the Buddhas is founded upon abstruse philosophical speculations, embracing very different notions respecting mind and matter—a first cause—and the nature and destiny of the human soul; and, whatever may be the case with regard to Brahmanism, it is certainly true of Buddhism that its philosophy is inseparably blended with its religion.

Further, though Buddhism, considered as a system of religion, was originally characterised by a great degree of simplicity, there can, I think, be no doubt that that simplicity was early abandoned, when Buddhism came to be generally diffused among the multitude.

A system inculcating the severest mental abstraction and physical privations (to say nothing of its speculative atheistical tendency) was not calculated for popular use; and it may be safely assumed that the same age which beheld Buddhism exalted to a public faith, saw it also materially modified in its essential characteristics. But at what precise

---

\* For the Sketch of Buddhism, see pp. 222-257 of this volume.

period, and in what country, did these modifications take place? And how far are they entitled to be considered part and parcel of *genuine* Buddhism? That they originated in India, the cradle of *Saugatism*, and that they were received by the Buddhas of that country, and consequently are entitled to be regarded as an integral portion of the system, are inferences which seem to me legitimately to flow, as well from the intrinsic considerations above adverted to, as from the fact, that the *Raksha Bhagavati*, the *Prajna Parmita*, and other of the most ancient Buddha works of authority, still extant in Nipâl, exhibit a strange complication of ideas purely *Saugata*, with others which are clearly drawn from the same fount with, or are borrowed from, that heterogeneous mass which we call Hinduism.

It is unquestionable that the books above adverted to are not peculiar to Nipâl; for they exhibit a system of doctrines, or at least of discipline, which is materially different from that which has prevailed for ages, and still continues to prevail there; and they are besides composed in the Sanscrit language—a language radically differing from the Nipâli. True it is that the learned *Saugatas* of Nipâl understand that language, and regard it as their sacred dialect; but from time immemorial they have possessed too little science, and too little literary encouragement to produce such vast and abstruse works as the *Raksha Bhagavati*, which alone contains 125,000 sentences, and was, I am persuaded, composed in India: such, too, is the decided opinion of every well-informed Buddha with whom I have conversed. The Buddhism of the *Raksha Bhagavati*, of the *Prajna Parmita*, and the rest of the nine Dharmas, is certainly not the simple and consistent creation of a single mind; but a vast mass compiled piece-meal, and at long intervals, by several persons, and owing its present scriptural *form* only to an individual. And upon the authority of these great works I venture to assert, not only that the founders of Buddhism differed among themselves, but also that many new teachers arose at various times, who modified each and all of the ancient doctrines; and that many of these new opinions were ultimately incorporated with the sacred writings of the sect.

It is obvious that such a system, prevailing, as it did, for ages in India before it was uprooted by violence, and subjected to the changes inseparable from transplantation into other climes, must be studied historically as well as philosophically, before we can hope to acquire a just conception of its entire or genuine character. My own opinion (as I have already intimated) is, that in the *Raksha Bhagavati* and the nine Dharmas are contained most of the essential opinions and practices inculcated by the Buddhism of India: but the following sketch and notes, not having been drawn from a direct or adequate acquaintance with those works, cannot pretend to exhibit the true features of that system, considered without reference to local interpolation. The sketch, however, assuredly exhibits many glimpses of those features, and therefore I have denominated it a “Sketch of Buddhism.” The cautious may, if they please, regard it as merely displaying some traces of the local *Saugatism* of Nipâl, in which they will perceive a large admixture of *Saiva* and *Sakta* principles. Owing to the vast extent and complexity of Buddhism—to its philosophy embracing a variety of very opposite opinions—to its mythology being blended with its philosophy—to a great number of leading terms in the

former being common (though, of course, in more or less different senses) to all the various schools of the latter—and, lastly, owing to our present ignorance how far and in what sense the followers of these diverse speculative systems adopted the whole of that which has come down to us as the practical religious system of the Buddhas, it becomes a very nice and arduous task to estimate, with any degree of correctness, the meaning of such detached statements as are presented to us, either by personal communication with these religionists, or by reference (any thing but complete) to their voluminous written authorities.

From such sources, however, I shall now attempt an elucidation, in the shape of notes, of such parts of my Buddha friend's sketch as seem to me to need it, and lie within the compass of my own information and ability.

*ALTERATIONS in the Notes appended to the Sketch.*

(For Note 1, substitute what follows.)

(1.) Here a sentence is quoted from the *Sambha Purana*; and it was at first my intention to have retained the original Sanscrit of the passage, cited from sacred authority, in this as in several subsequent instances. Upon reflection, however, I believe it will be better to omit these citations altogether, which are of very various, and often (as I have proved) of very doubtful authority or accuracy; and to endeavour to illustrate the statements of my friend by some remarks which my own more recent investigations have enabled me to make.

The *Sambha* or *Swoyambha Purāna* is a local work peculiar to Nipāl; but many other Buddha scriptures, which are not local and are of high authority, symbolize the ruling powers of nature by the letters of the alphabet;—and some of those scriptures (chiefly perhaps such as are of an *Aishwarika* tendency) ascribe the pre-eminence among these letters to A, U, and M, forming the mystic word *Aum*, which would appear to be not less revered by Bauddhas than by Brahmanists. The invocation of the *Tri Ratna*, or Triad (“*namah BUDDHAIYA, namah DHARMAIYA, namah SANGAIYA*”) is so popular and prevalent with the Bauddhas that one might almost be justified in calling it their confession of faith.

A, the Bauddhas say, is the “*vija mantra*” of the person (*surir*) BUDDHA;—U, the “*vija mantra*” of the person DHARMA;—and M, that of the person SANGA; and these three persons form the Buddhist Triad:—a Triad consisting not merely of the attributes of a first cause or causes, nor (as has been supposed) of abstract moral qualities,—but of persons; at least of mythological persons.

The *Bauddhas*, however, differ in their conceptions both of the relative rank and of the positive character of the two first of these three persons; as indeed they do upon many other points of their mythology, owing to their philosophical differences. In this place I can only observe, in regard to the Triad, that, according to the *Aishwarikas*, BUDDHA is an immaterial principle, (“*bodhan atmika iti Buddha*”) the active agent in creation, and the *first* member of the Triad: DHARMA, a material principle (“*dhāran atmika iti Dharma*”), the passive agent in creation, and the *second* member of the Triad: SANGA, a

principle compounded of the other two ( "*Samudaiyatmika iti Sanga* "), the third member of the Triad, and the *direct* and *immediate* agent in creation; deriving as well his origin as his powers from the union of the essences of BUDDHA and DHARMA.

The vulgar system represents BUDDHA and DHARMA as man and wife, and SANGA as their son.

(For Note 2, substitute what follows.)

(2.) Another *sloka* is here quoted; but it will not entirely justify the palpably Brahmanical language of the text;—in which, moreover, there is, I think, some confusion of the opposite tenets of two discordant sects of the *Aishwarikas*.

The doctrine of the one sect, which, as the more approved, is called the right-handed, or *Dakshin Achar*,—has been stated above: that of the other, which is stigmatised as the left-handed, or *Vamachar*,—consists in postponing the active principle, *Buddha*, to the passive principle, *Dharma*. What the analogous philosophical tenets of these *Vámachári Aishwarikas* are, I cannot learn, or imagine: for, to postpone mind to matter would seem necessarily to involve a denial of mind as distinct from, and independent of, matter; and such a denial is possibly at the bottom of the *Vámachári* doctrine; which in that case must be referred to the *Swobhávika* school. The primitive *Swobhávikas* do not probably admit the notion of a Triad. With the *Prájnika Swobhávikas* (also, I believe, designated as *Vámáchár*) *Dharma*, or Deified Nature, is the *first* member of the Triad: *Buddha*, representing the active force of nature, in *Pravritti*, is the *second* member: and *Sanga* the *third*.

There is no difference of opinion as to the character or rank of the third member of the Triad, called *Sanga*, who is universally considered the lowest, and a dependant personage; all agreeing that "from the union of the essences of *Prajna* and *Upáya* (or *Upáya* and *Prajna*, according to the *Vamacharis*) sprang the world, which is *Sanga*:" meaning, with the *Aishwarikas*, a creation properly so called,—with the *Swobhávikas*, that spontaneous reproduction of forms which results necessarily from the principles of nature, without divine concurrence.

The triadic doctrine of all the schools is referable solely to *Pravritti*. In *Nirvritti*, *Sanga* vanishes by universal consent: but in regard to the state of the two other members of the Triad there is great discordance of opinions. The *Aishwarikas*, who admit only one immaterial cause of all things, resolve *Dharma*, in *Nirvritti*, into *Buddha*: while those *Aishwarikas* who contend that all things proceeded from matter and mind, consider *Prajna Upáya* as forming a Biunity in *Nirvritti*. Those again (the *Swobhávikas*) who hold matter to be the sole substance, and regard *Dharma* as *Diva Natura*, reunite *Buddha*, in the state of *Nirvritti*, with *Dharma*, from whom, in the state of *Pravritti*, he emanated. Thus the Triad of all the schools resolves itself into a Duad; and that of some dwindles into a Monad. The whole notion of a Triad is probably foreign to primitive Buddhism; though it is doubtless of a comparatively remote date, and of wide acceptance. I have found it in Ceylon and in Bhót, as well as in Nipál: and, I think, also have discovered it in the caves of the West of India.

(For Note 3, substitute what follows.)

(3.) The Triadic doctrine of the *Aishwarikas*, as above stated, seems to resolve itself (so far as it is intelligible) merely into gross generative ideas of creation. Some of them, however, had a more refined idea of that grand operation of the Almighty; for they acknowledge a creation resulting from the volition (*Dhyán*) of an immaterial eternal *Adi Buddha*. The deduction of the five *Dhyáni Buddhas*, and five *Dhyáni Bodhisatvas*, from this *Adi Buddha*, will be seen farther on. This vague conception of a divine creation is here, in the text, improperly mixed with the generative creations of various Teachers.

(For Note 10, substitute what follows.)

(10.) This limited reply is to be attributed to my friend, and not to his books. Matter is called *Prakriti* by the *Bauddhas*, as well as by the Brahmanists: and a favourite title of the Supreme *Dharma*, or PRAJNA, is PRAKRITESWARI.

(For Note 12, substitute what follows.)

(12.) The “others,” here alluded to, are the *Swabhávikas*. Such ideas as I have been enabled to form of their philosophical tenets will be found at pp. 435—440. Vol. XVI. Bengal Asiatic Society’s Transactions.—Perhaps I have, in that place, stated too favourably the doctrine of the simple *Swábhavikas*, or party opposed to the *Prájñika Swabhávikas*: and it may at least be surmised, that the former held an eternal revolution of matter (*Pravritti*) and intelligence (*Nirvritti*) to be the system of Nature. The *Prájñika Swabhávikas* unitized the powers, or forces, of matter in the state of *Nirvritti*; and invested that Unity with some of the essential attributes of Godhead, such as Eternity and Infinity. The simple *Swabhávikas* did not unitize the powers of nature in the state of *Nirvritti*: in which state, dispersed as those powers were, and stripped too as they were of every sensible property of matter, it is no great wonder that they were declared to be lost, and reduced to nothing (*SÚNYATA*) by the adversaries of this school; and that the followers of such tenets were, by the Brahmans, called in derision *Súnya-Vádís*. My own impression is, that the *Swabhávikas*, in general, never could have so utterly disregarded the plain sense of the ancient maxim—*ex nihilo nil*: and, consequently, that their *súnyata* must be understood in another sense: for which see Note 20.

(Note 14, modify as follows.)

(14.) Omit the référence at the end, which runs thus, “see on to Note 15,” and substitute the words (Vide Bengal Asiatic Society’s Transactions) *loco citato*.

(For Note 15, substitute what follows.)

(15.) The text of my friend alludes in this and what follows to the tenets of the *Kármikas* and *Yátnikas*. A faint sketch of the philosophical dogmas of these schools will be seen in the Bengal Asiatic Society’s Transactions, *loco citato*.

(Note 16, modify as follows.)

(16.) Omit the conclusion of this note, from the words, “But whose *Dhyán*?” to the end.

(For Note 17, substitute what follows.)

(17.) These terms are common to all the schools of *Bauddha* philosophy and theology. *Pravritti* imports the state in which the forming and changing powers of the Universe (whether considered as of immaterial or material natures, or both, or only the latter) exist, in connexion with that upon which they operate; and by their operation upon which all particular palpable forms, such as compose the matter of our world, and of other superior and inferior worlds, begin to exist, as by the cessation of that operation, or influence, these worlds cease to be. *Nirvritti* signifies the state in which the elements of all things, (whatever be their nature,) exist abstractedly, and apart from all particular palpable forms, such as the human senses and understanding are cognizant of. *Pravritti* likewise signifies, in a theological sense, Mundane things and existences; *Nirvritti*, the opposite.

With respect to self-conscious and sentient beings, to the state of *Pravritti* are ascribed immutability, rest, bliss: to the state of *Nirvritti*, mutability, action, pain. The adversaries of the *Swabhāvikas* assert that their bliss in *Nirvritti* is annihilation. As already intimated, I do not think so.

In a word, *Nirvritti* means abstraction; *Pravritti*, concretion. *Nirvritti* is formed from *Nirvan*—but *Pravritti* has no *Pravan*.

(For Note 25, substitute what follows.)

(25.) SARVĀRTHA SIDDHA was the name of SAKYA, until he had acquired *bodhiṇyān*, and attained to the rank of a *Buddha*; when he was called SĀKYA SINHA, and also GOUTAMA: both which are said to be ancestral names of the race from which he sprang. SARVĀRTHA SIDDHA derived his birth *immediately* from the *Sākya Vansa*; *remotely*, from the *Goutama Vansa*. It is generally thought that SADHÓDANA was a Prince of Magadha, or Bahar. The *Bauddha* books of Nipāl universally call SAKYA SINHA the son of SADHÓDANA RAJA and MAYA DEVI; but they assign Ganga Ságura as the place of his birth. Is any thing known of SADHÓDANA RAJA? or of the *Sākya Vansa*, to which this Raja is said to have belonged? or of the *Goutama Vansa*, which is affirmed to be the remote stem of the *Sākya Vansa*? YAS-ODRA was SAKYA's wife; and RAHÚLA BHADRA his son.

It is a strange notion of Buchanan's, that SAKYA SINHA and GOUTAMA are different persons. They are unquestionably but two names of the seventh *Máha Yániká Buddha*.